# dom, centar, kuća, platforma

Galerija Galženica
23/10/2015

Nije neobično da historizaciju ustanova zaduženih za proizvodnju i distribuciju kulture prati određena nejasnoća, štoviše terminološki i kategorijalni nered. Sam pojam kulture je višeznačan, čak inherentno kontradiktoran, pa je od stručnjaka koji se bave kulturnim praksama teško očekivati jasne i čvrste definicije. Postoji, recimo, umjetnička kultura, ali postoji i kultura psovanja – o odurnom običaju pljuvanja po cesti da i ne govorimo, premda bi se i za pljuvanje moglo reći da je primjena kulture sela u kulturi grada – koja se, pak, kosi s kulturom dobrog odgoja, pa ako niste lingvist, pisac ili antropolog, u toj ćete kulturi prije vidjeti nedostatak svake kulture. Bilo kako bilo, oko jednoga se svi slažu: kulturu čini sve ono što ljudi svakodnevno rade. Naglasak je, dakle, na ljudima, a ne na objektima (knjigama, slikama, filmovima, kazališnim predstavama itd.), na iskustvu i procesu, a ne na vlasništvu ili društvenom statusu.

Osmišljavanju ove izložbe pristupili smo stoga iz pozicije sudionika u kulturnim procesima, ali ne odozgo – iz pozicije određene institucionalne moći – nego odozdo, iz pozicije korisnika kulturnih programa. Zašto na sve ne bismo gledali iz perspektive vlastitog iskustva? Umjesto povijesnih povelja o osnivanju, političkih odluka, službenih akata, planova i programa, možda je vrijeme da se prisjetimo načina na koji smo mi sami činili kulturu, posjećujući knjižnice, gledajući filmove, učeći plesati, štrikati, slikati ili jednostavno, čavrljajući i zabavljajući se s čašom vina u ruci na premijeri neke izložbe ili kazališne predstave.

Iz te perspektive, nameću se četiri različita načina sudjelovanja u proizvodnji i potrošnji institucionalne kulture. Svaki od njih zapravo predstavlja određeni kulturni model. Ti modeli su: dom, centar, kuća i platforma.

There is nothing unusual about the fact that the attempts to historicize institutions in charge of producing and distributing culture are accompanied by a certain ambiguity or even by a terminological and categorical confusion. The very notion of culture is in itself ambiguous, even inherently contradictory, so we cannot expect from the experts who deal in cultural practices to provide us with a clear and firm definition. For example, we have the culture of art, but we also have the culture of swearing – not to mention the custom of spitting on the street, even though spitting could also be considered as a part of the process of rural culture infiltrating urban culture – which is in conflict with the culture of good manners, so if you are not a linguist, writer or an anthropologist, you are more likely to notice the lack of culture in these practices. Be that as it may, there is one thing that everybody agrees on: culture consists of everything that people do on a daily basis. Therefore, the emphasis is on people and not on objects (books, paintings, movies, plays, etc.), on the experience and the process and not on the question of ownership or social status.

We approached the conceptualization of this exhibition from the position of a participant in cultural processes, that is, by taking the bottom–up approach of the users of cultural programmes thus rejecting to adopt the position of an institutional power. And why wouldn't we take the perspective of our own experiences? Instead of focusing on historic foundation charters, political decisions, official documents, plans and programmes, it just might be the right time to recall how we made culture happen: by visiting libraries, watching movies, learning how to dance, knit, paint or by simply chatting and having fun – with a glass of wine in our hands – at an opening of an exhibition or a play.

Seen from this perspective, there are four different ways of participating in the production and consumption of institutional culture. Each of these ways is actually a particular cultural model. And these models are: home, centre, house and platform.

U malom mjestu u kojem sam odrastao, Dom se kulture isticao ne samo svojim sadržajem, nego i svojim izgledom. Jednostavna tipska građevina koju su vlasti serijski gradile po cijeloj zemlji imala je, naime, na svom ulazu, umjesto ravnih greda, lučno nadsvođe, točnije četiri vitka luka, na kojima je počivao povelik balkon. Osim par bogomolja, niti jedna druga privatna ili javna građevina u kraju nije imala lučno svođenje. Djeci, kakva smo bila, to je bio dovoljan znak da je tu riječ o nečemu važnom, nečemu što nadilazi naš svakodnevni život razapet između škole i igrališta. Četiri luka, međutim, nisu upućivala ni na što ekskluzivno, ni na što drugo doli na neuglednu i neveliku kino-dvoranu. Postojala je mala javna knjižnica, ali iz perspektive učenika, ona se činila kao neočekivana i neželjena ekstenzija školskih aktivnosti. U kombinaciji s predvorjem, kinodvorana bila je, uz školu i igralište, centar našeg društvenog života. U njoj smo sudjelovali na obilježavanju važnih društveno-političkih obljetnica i bili kolektivno indoktrinirani partizanskim filmovima; na njezinoj smo pozornici recitirali pjesme, svirali ili plesali nadgledani stvarnim i simboličkim autoritetima, ali smo s istih tih sjedalica, slobodni od nastavničke i roditeljske kontrole, zavjerenički okruženi mrakom, uranjali u svijet međunarodne kinematografije. Danas zvuči gotovo nevjerojatno da smo na nedjeljnoj matineji, na projekcijama, dakle, namijenjenima djeci, krajem 70-ih godina 20. stoljeća, iz nedjelje u nedjelju gledali holivudske i europske umjetničke filmove, trilere, akcijske, erotske i horor filmove. U osjetljivim pubertetskim godinama, više smo o 'čojstvu i junaštvu' naučili gledajući filmove Brucea Leeja, nego ispunjavajući različite, ideološki prenapregnute školske zadaće. Premda toga tada nismo bili svjesni – gledali smo, naravno, sasvim nešto drugo – ali, više smo naučili o ravnopravnosti spolova, gledajući švedske erotske filmove (riječ je, naravno, o soft-porn žanru, nerijetko namijenjenom tinejdžerskoj populaciji u zapadnoj Europi), nego promatrajući društvo oko sebe. Nije tako bilo samo u mom 'malom mistu'. Primjerice, u kinu đurđevačkog Doma kulture, tako je 130 posjetitelja 10. siječnja 1987. pogledalo film 'Paris-Texas', remek-djelo tzv. umjetničke kinematografije, dok je u ožujku iste godine njemački erotski film 'Salon za masažu' pogledalo 164 gledatelja. Istinabog, ne na nedjeljnoj matineji, ali nije ni svako 'malo misto' (bilo) isto.

In a small town where I grew up, the Home of Culture stood out not only on the basis of its content but because of its appearance. This simple standard-type building, the likes of which were built all over the country by the government, had an arched entrance consisting of four lean arches with a sizable balcony mounted on the top. Except of a couple of churches, no other private or public building had an archway. To us children, that was proof enough that this was an important place, something which transcended our daily lives divided between the school and the playground. However, these four arches did not disclose anything exclusive, nothing but a drab and rather small movie theatre. It's true that there was also a small public library, but from the perspective of students, it was perceived as an unexpected and unwanted extension of school activities. In addition to the school and the playground, the movie theatre and its lobby was the centre of our social lives. It was where we celebrated important socio-political anniversaries and where we were collectively indoctrinated by partisan films; it was where we recited poems, played music and danced on stage under the supervision of our real and symbolic authorities. However, from these same seats – free from parental and teacher control – as conspirators shrouded by darkness, we immersed ourselves into the world of international cinema. It sounds almost unbelievable now that we, in the late 1970s, spent our Sundays – at the screenings of supposedly appropriate films for kids – watching Hollywood and European art films, thrillers, action, erotic and horror films. During our sensitive period of adolescence, we learned more about 'humanity and bravery' by watching Bruce Lee's films than we did by doing our ideologically saturated school assignments. Although we weren't aware of it at the time – we were, of course, watching something completely different – we learned more about gender equality by watching Swedish erotic films than we did from the society we lived in (these were, of course, films of the soft–porn genre which were, more often than not, intended for Western European teenage audiences). And this wasn't just what happened in my 'little town on the prairie'. For example, on 10 January, 1987, at the Đurđevac Home of Culture, 130 people saw Wim Wenders' masterpiece 'Paris, Texas', while the German erotic film 'The Massage Parlour', screened the same year in March, had an audience of 164 people. To be fair, not at the Sunday matinee, but not all 'little towns on the prairie' were the same.

Nedjeljna matineja bila je meni i mojim vršnjacima neobičan trenutak slobode. Dok su nam roditelji još uvijek strogo regulirali pristup televiziji, osobito u kasnijim satima, u kinodvorani Doma kulture, u kojem se miris pobacanog drvenog poda miješao s blagim mirisom urina iz wc-a, bili smo apsolutno slobodni kulturni konzumenti. Ako nam se film iz nekog razloga nije sviđao, igrali bi fliper i arkadne igre u predvorju. Dok je novinski tisak – barem onaj koji je nama bio dostupan – najvećim dijelom oskudijevao u boji i finijoj vrsti papira, filmski plakati, koji su oglašavali film, zajedno s par, na sjajnom papiru i u punom koloru, otisnutih fotografija, putem kojih smo kao kroz ključanicu virili u sadržaj filma, predstavljali su osobit prozor u svijet, daleko od monotonije provincijske svakodnevice.

Dom kulture –
Centar za kulturu Đurđevac,
Vladimira Nazora 2



Sve do raspada bivše države i popularizacije vhs tehnologije, kinodvorana je bila žila kucavica svake kulturne ustanove, pa možda i onoga što kulturalni studiji zovu strukturom osjećaja i slično. Barem u provinciji. Gdjegod je Dom kulture bio opremljen projekcijskom tehnologijom, kinodvorana je po svom društvenom utjecaju uvelike nadilazila sve druge sadržaje: koncerte, priredbe, posudbu knjiga, tečajeve i slično. Trebat će dočekati pojavu multipleks kino-dvorane, da bi javno prikazivanje filma ponovno dobilo na svojoj važnosti, ali to je stvar jedne druge problematike.

To me and my peers, the Sunday matinees were an unprecedented moment of freedom. While our parents were still strictly controlling our access to the TV, especially during late hours, in the movie theatre at the Home of Culture, where the smell of loosely-fitted wooden floors mixed with the faint odour of urine emanating from the bathroom, we were absolutely free cultural consumers.

Dom kulture (POUVG)
Trg Stjepana radića 5
Velika Gorica

If we didn't like the film for some reason, we would play pinball or arcade machines in the lobby. While the newspaper print – at least one available to us – was mostly lacking in colour or paper quality, the movie posters together with a couple of photographs – printed in full-colour on glossy paper – enabled us to take a peek into the wondrous world removed from our banal everyday life in the socialist periphery.

Till the breakup of the former state and the popularization of VHS technology, the movie theatre was the lifeblood of every cultural institution, and perhaps of what cultural studies call the culture of everyday life or the structure of feeling and the like. At least it was so in the periphery. In the instances where the House of Culture was equipped with film screening technology, the social impact of a movie theatre greatly surpassed all other contents: concerts, performances, book lending, courses, etc. Only with the emergence of multiplex movie theatres did the public movie screenings regain some of its importance, but this an issue for a different discussion.

Naziv Centar za kulturu ili Kulturni centar ili, još znakovitije, Kulturno-informativni centar, uvijek me podsjećao na nešto automatizirano, na određenu distancu, čak i hladnoću. Pokušam li vizualizirati tu asocijaciju ispred očiju mi se vrte halogene svjetiljke, grafike pod staklima ovješene na zid, mesing, rosfraj, staklo. Osmišljen krajem 70-ih, ali potpuno zaživjevši 80-ih godina 20. stoljeća, kulturni je centar bio tipična gradska institucija, koja se na vrhuncu urbanizacije u bivšoj državi prelila i na provinciju. Ako i nisu nosile isto, tehnokratsko ime, kulturne su institucije u provinciji, i po svojoj arhitekturi i po svom programu, često zrcalile promjenu paradigme. Najprije je – u Zagrebu, naravno – postalo jasno da se kulturna institucija može izgraditi i bez kinodvorane i knjižnice. Pojavile su se neke strane riječi kao što su polivalentno, multimedijalno i slično, da bi točku na i udarili ugostiteljski sadržaji. Ugostiteljski sadržaji postojali su i prije, ali su se ograničavali ili na rad u večernjim satima ili na rad prilikom obilježavanja značajnih društvenih događaja. Ugostiteljski sadržaji u novim kulturnim institucijama, takozvanim centrima, funkcionirali su zapravo po poduzetničkom principu: bio je to novi oblik gostionice, koji će s vremenom dobiti ime 'kafić' i kojemu vlasnik nije bio pojedinac nego tzv. radna organizacija. Međutim, možda će presudni karakter novom obliku kulturne institucije dati umjetnička galerija. Krajem 70-ih i tijekom 80-ih godina, niz se prostora u starim ili u novoizgrađenim kulturnim ustanovama upušta u muzejsko-galerijski posao, producirajući i izlažući radove suvremenih umjetnika, ali i radove tzv. umjetnika-amatera. U Hrvatskoj se razvoj suvremene umjetnosti, ali i umjetničkog amaterizma ne može dobro sagledati bez ovog galerijskog buma, koji shodno socijalističkom društvu u kojem je pokrenut nije imao komercijalni, nego društveni, na neki način prosvjetiteljski karakter. Za podizanje i demokratizaciju standarda u muzejsko-galerijskom radu 80-ih godina, bile su zaslužne upravo galerije koje su djelovale u okviru kulturnih centara. Postalo je uobičajeno da u pristojnom prostoru tzv. bijele kocke izložite svoje radove, dobijete katalog, tekst profesionalnog kritičara i koktel na otvorenju. Čak su se i hodnici kulturnih centara pretvarali u galerije. Na početku, u skladu s ukusom publike, dominirale su štafelajne slike i grafike, no već krajem 80-ih godina, galerije kulturnih centara upuštaju se u organizaciju eksperimentalnih umjetničkih projekata (ambijentalne instalacije, videoumjetnost itd.).

he will achieve this primarily through his own devices.' LASLO VARGA

The name Centre for Culture or Cultural Centre or – even more telling – Cultural and Information Centre, always reminded me of something automated, of keeping a certain distance, evoking a feeling of coldness. When I try to visualize this mental image, I see halogen lamps, graphics under glass framings hanging on walls, brass, stainless steel, glass. Conceived in the late 1970s and reaching its peak in the 1980s, a cultural centre was a typical urban institution which, at the height of urbanization in the former country, penetrated into the periphery. Even when they had different technocratic names, cultural institutions in the periphery mirrored the paradigm shift of their urban counterparts which reflected on their architecture, as well as on their programmes. First – in Zagreb, of course – it became apparent that a cultural institution can be built without a movie theatre or a library. Some new loanwords such as multifunctional and multimedia entered the language, with catering services gaining prominence. Catering facilities were there before but they only worked the evening hours, or during celebrations of important social events. The catering services in these new cultural institutions or the so–called centres functioned as a business enterprise: this was a new form of a tavern which would later become known as a 'coffee bar' and which had no individual owner but was managed by a work organization. However, perhaps it was the art gallery that gave this new cultural institution its distinctive character. In the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s, a number of old and newly built cultural institutions became involved in museum and gallery work, producing and exhibiting works of contemporary artists, as well as of amateur artists. The development of contemporary art and artistic amateurism in Croatia cannot be truly understood without taking into account this boom in galleries which – in accordance with the principles of the socialist society – did not have a commercial but a social and, in a way, an educational character. The galleries operating within the framework of cultural centres are the ones to be credited for raising the standards and making them more democratic in the field of museums and galleries during the 1980s. It became commonplace to exhibit your work in a decent-looking space or within the so-called white cube, to get an exhibition catalogue, a text written by a professional critic and a complimentary cocktail at the opening. Even the lobbies of cultural centres were being turned into galleries. At the

Istini za volju, teško je procijeniti koje su od ove dvije kulturne forme više revolucionirale razvoj kulturnih institucija – kafić ili galerija. Veže ih zajednički interes prema slikama (uljima na platnu, grafikama, crtežima, plakatima itd.), posebnoj (halogenoj) rasvjeti, staklu, mesingu i provođenju slobodnog vremena s kavom na stolu ili koktelom u rukama. Čini se da je 80-ih godina postojalo nekoliko načina da se pokaže prestiž, a jedan je svakako bio vezan za likovnu umjetnost. Građani su kupovali slike i grafike, kulturni centri su otvarali galerije nudeći surogat nepostojećem umjetničkom tržištu, a ugostitelji su zidove restorana i kafića ukrašavali slikama čiji su okviri bili višestruko skuplji od samih slika.

Kulturni centar na Peščenici (KNAP), Ivanićgradska 41a, Zagreb

Dom mladih, Savska bb, Split

beginning, galleries predominantly exhibited easel paintings and graphics thus reflecting the audience's tastes. However, at the end of the 1980s, the cultural centres' galleries started to organize experimental art projects (ambient installations, video-art, etc.).

To be honest, it's difficult to say which of these two cultural forms had a greater impact on the development of cultural institutions – a coffee bar or a gallery. What connects them is their shared interest in paintings (oil paintings, graphics, drawings, posters, etc.), special (halogen) lighting, glass, brass and spending downtime with a coffee on the table or a cocktail in hand. It seems as though there were a couple of ways of expressing prestige in the 1980s, and one of them certainly entailed visual arts. The citizens were buying paintings and graphics; cultural centres were opening galleries offering a substitute for a non-existent art market, while the caterers decorated the walls of the restaurants and bars with paintings whose frames were several times more expensive than the paintings themselves.

Narodno sveučilište
Dubrava, Cerska 1, Zagreb

U svibnju ove godine, u tjedniku Globus, izašla je duža reportaža o radu zagrebačke Laube – kuće za ljude i umjetnost, osobite muzejsko-galerijske institucije koja je u vrlo kratkom roku pobrala simpatije kulturne javnosti. Reportaža bi ostala relativno neprimijećena da novinar Boris Vlašić nije u tekstu iznio nekoliko zanimljivih sudova. Lauba, tvrdi Vlašić, 'upumpava život u Zagreb'; ona je 'alternativni prostor koji nije ni muzej ni galerija'; 'mjesto ne samo u izložbenom smislu nego i (...) prostor društvenih događanja'; Lauba, također, promiče 'zvuk asfalta' i 'poklanja ljudima lijepe trenutke' itd. U početku sam pomislio da je riječ o danas sve dominantnijoj novinskoj formi – plaćenom oglasu, no igrom slučaja, saznao sam naknadno da to nije istina. Bila je, zapravo, riječ o tzv. objektivnom, novinarskom pogledu na rad ove institucije. Premda je Lauba zapravo, kako i sam Vlašić kaže, privatna galerija zagrebačkog poduzetnika Tomislava Klička, poanta reportaže nije ležala na njezinoj ulozi u hrvatskom muzejsko-galerijskom sistemu, na novostima koje Lauba unosi u taj inertni okoliš, nego u naglašavanju Laubinog utjecaja na zagrebački kulturni život u cijelosti. Doista, sadržaji koje Lauba proizvodi nisu samo likovno-umjetnički. U prostoru Laube možete pogledati kazališnu predstavu, odslušati koncert, pratiti filmski ili dizajnerski festival, pohađati različite radionice. Kao i forma kulturno-informativnog centra svojevremeno, i ona je multimedijalna i polivalentna, i ona vas više informira i zabavlja, nego obrazuje. Za razliku, međutim, od kulturnog centra čiji je osnivač lokalna ili državna samouprava, ona vas sasvim u skladu s duhom vremena poziva u poslovni odnos kroz formu takozvanog co-workinga i slično. Na kulturnom polju postsocijalističke Hrvatske, Lauba je simbol javno-privatnog partnerstva, mogući oblik održivog kulturnog razvoja, dokaz da kulturni život uz određene ustupke tržištu može zadržati visoku razinu kvalitete i prepoznatljivosti. Stoga, ne treba čuditi da je, s obzirom na proklamiranu kulturnu politiku Vlade RH, Lauba ove godine dobila najveću financijsku potporu od strane Ministarstva kulture.

No, čak i na nešto užem polju muzejsko-galerijske struke, Lauba je dobar primjer primijene jedne hibridne, javno-privatne, komercijalno-neprofitne forme rada. U kulturi je, naime, za mnoge blasfemična sinergija ekonomskog i kulturnog kapitala, počela upravo pod krovovima muzeja i galerija. Od ponovnog otvaranja Muzeja za modernu umjetnost

This year in May, magazine Globus published a feature article on Lauba – People and Art House, one of a kind museum and gallery institution in Zagreb which garnered cultural public's sympathy in a very short time. The article would probably go unnoticed if the journalist Boris Vlašić didn't put forward some interesting opinions. Lauba, Vlašić claims, 'pumps life into Zagreb'; it is 'an alternative space which is not a museum or a gallery'; 'it is not only an exhibition space but also (...) a space for social events'; Lauba also promotes 'the sound of the asphalt' and 'brings beautiful experiences to people' etc. At first I thought that this was an instance of the all-pervasive new form of journalism – the paid advertisement – but by chance, I discovered that it wasn't the case. In fact, here we have an example of the so-called journalistic objectivity in assessing the work of this institution. Although Lauba is, as Vlašić says, a private gallery owned by a businessman from Zagreb, Tomislav Kličko, the point of this article didn't lie in analysing the role of Lauba within the Croatian system of museums and galleries or the novelties which Lauba introduced into this outdated environment, but in emphasizing Lauba's influence on Zagreb's cultural life as a whole. Indeed, the content which Lauba produces isn't just of a visual arts variety. In Lauba's space, you can also watch a play, listen to a concert, attend a film or design festival or take part in various workshops. As a Cultural and Information Centre before it, Lauba is also multimedial and multifunctional and it is here to inform and entertain you, rather than educate you. Contrary to Cultural Centres founded by the local or state government, it invites you – in accordance with the spirit of the time – to enter in a business relationship which takes the form of the so–called co–working. Within the cultural field of the post-socialist Croatia, Lauba is a symbol of a public-private partnership, the possible form of a sustainable cultural development, a proof that cultural life – with certain concessions to the market – can maintain a high level of quality and recognition. So, it shouldn't come as a surprise that, given the proclaimed cultural policy of Croatian Government, it was Lauba which received the largest financial support from the Ministry of Culture this year.

u New Yorku, pod izdašnim financijskim – ispostavit će se kasnije, i programskim – pokroviteljstvom telekomunikacijske kompanije AT&T, prošlo je više od 30 godina, ali razmjena između onih koji posjeduju kulturno (umjetničko) i financijsko blago ne jenjava i nije više ekskluzivno vezana za Sjedinjene države. Kultura se brendira, nudi na korištenje, preuzimajući rječnik i metodologiju liberalne ekonomije, dok se kapital 'podruštvljuje', slijedeći mantru o javnom dobru, kulturnoj i civilizacijskoj baštini, održivosti i slično. Svaka je debata o komercijalizaciji Laube, o balansu između kulturnih i 'onih drugih' sadržaja (korporacijske proslave, vjenčanja itd.) stoga u startu besmislena. Čak i u slučaju da zanemarimo činjenicu da je Lauba jedinstven primjer privatnog poduzetništva u kulturi, novi model muzejsko-galerijske institucije koji se radijalno širi na čitavo područje zagrebačke kulturne scene, još uvijek je riječ o dovoljno inovativnom događaju, da bi ga se olako diskvalificiralo iz razmišljanja o kulturnoj politici.

Nešto od te novine sadržano je i u imenu ove institucije. Sjećam se da sam bio pomalo razočaran onim proširenjem kuća za umjetnosti i ljude. Očekivao sam nešto neutralnije, općenitije, demokratičnije; nešto što u nazivu ima centar, galeriju, zbirku, institut i slično. Mislio sam da će kuća zvučati suviše ekskluzivno i opskurno. Međutim, pokazalo se suprotno. Premda je Lauba oko sebe okupila jednu novu, do tada možda nevidljivu publiku, još uvijek svojim aktivnostima uspijeva privući širi spektar zagrebačke publike, polako, ali sigurno oduzimajući ju ostalim kulturnim institucijama. Lauba nas je, naime, još jednom podsjetila na ono što su domaće kulturne institucije u međuvremenu zaboravile, da su, između ostalog, i kuće za ljude.

Lauba - kuća za ljude i umjetnost, Baruna Filipovića 23a, Zagreb

Even within a somewhat narrower field of museum and gallery culture, Lauba is a good example of the implementation of hybrid, private-public, commercial and non-profit organization principles. In fact, the synergy of economic and symbolic capital in culture – which many consider blasphemous – was first conceived under the roofs of museums and galleries. More than 30 years has passed since the reopening of the Museum of Modern Art in New York under the generous financial sponsorship of the AT&T telecommunications corporation – which later, as it turned out, also came under their programme sponsorship – but the exchange between those who possess cultural (art) and financial wealth doesn't seem to be waning and it is no longer exclusively linked to the United States. Culture is becoming a brand to be consumed as it adopts the vocabulary and methodology of liberal economy, while capital is becoming more social, following the mantra about public good, cultural and civilizational heritage, etc. Thus, going into a debate about the commercialization of Lauba, the balance between cultural and 'other' contents (corporate parties, weddings, etc.) is quite pointless. Even if we disregard the fact that Lauba is a unique example of a private business enterprise in culture, a new model of a museum and gallery institution which radially expands into the entire field of Zagreb's cultural scene, it is still a sufficiently innovative phenomenon which mustn't be excluded from any deliberations on cultural policy.

The name of this institution incorporates some of its novelty. I remember my disappointment with Lauba's extended name People and Art House. I expected something more neutral, general, democratic, something which has the word centre, gallery, collection or institute in its name. I thought that putting house in the name would make it sound too exclusive and obscure. However, the opposite turned out to be true. Although Lauba appeals to a new, perhaps previously invisible audience, it also manages to attract a wide range of Zagreb's audience, slowly but surely drawing them away from other cultural institutions. In fact, Lauba has once again reminded us of what other local cultural institutions have forgotten: that they are, among other things, people houses.

Problem samoodrživosti, idealne ravnoteže između komercijalnih i umjetničkih programa, između popularnosti i kvalitete u centru je programske politike još jedne kulturne ustanove. Riječ je o zagrebačkom Centru za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade, poznatijem kao Pogon. Ovaj novi model institucije u kulturi, iniciran od strane Saveza udruga Operacija Grad i osnovan u partnerstvu s Gradom Zagrebom 2008., zapravo je matična ustanova za sve grassroot organizacije, bilo da su društvenog (civilnog) ili umjetničkog predznaka, i to ne samo na području Zagreba (ovih se dana, naime, vode pregovori o osnivanju sličnih kulturnih ustanova u Splitu, Puli, Rijeci, Karlovcu, Čakovcu itd.). Na prvi pogled, teško je razlikovati program rada starih kulturnih ustanova od Pogona. Glavni sadržaj ovih institucija i dalje se vrti oko umjetničkih praksi: ples, film, koncerti, izložbe, radionice itd., pa se kao krajnji korisnik morate zapitati čemu još jedna kulturna institucija. (Zanimljivo je da među zastupljenim programima izdavaštva gotovo i nema i da se nakon čuvene biblioteke Centra za kulturu i obrazovanje Zagreb iz 70-ih i 80-ih godina, niti jedan kulturni centar nije profilirao na izdavačkoj sceni. Razlog tome je jednostavan: među kulturnim sadržajima nad kojima su stare kulturne institucije imale monopol, privatno je poduzetništvo najveći interes pronašlo u obrazovanju, izdavaštvu i kinematografiji) ). Međutim, iza identičnih žanrova (medija) i praksi, kriju se druge teme, aktualniji društveni problemi i drugačiji komunikacijski kanali. Umjesto radničkih prava, novi se kulturni centri sada bave pravima LGBT manjina; umjesto problema otuđenja, pojavio se problem privatizacije javnog dobra; umjesto oglasnih ploča, izrađuju se mrežne stranice i moderiraju društvene mreže itd. Niz burnih i prijelomnih događaja početkom 90-ih na lokalnoj je i međunarodnoj razini drastično izmijenio paradigmu rada kulturnih institucija. Ako, u osnovi, neočekivanim političkim i ekonomskim potresima pridodate i tehnološku, odnosno komunikacijsku revoluciju, potreba za urgentnim odgovorom na novonastalu situaciju u vidu neke organizirane i zajedničke društvene reakcije – kako na razini umjetničke, tako i na razini svakodnevne (građanske) kulture – činila se razložnim razvojem situacije. Centar za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade su pokrenuli mladi ljudi nakon što u okviru starih kulturnih centara doista nisu mogli pronaći svoje društvene i kulturne interese (jaz između starih i novih institucija je danas nešto manji, ali se dinamika osobito zagrebačke kulturne scene još uvijek zasniva na toj razlici).

The problem of self-sustainability, achieving a perfect balance between commercial and art programmes, between popularity and quality is in the focus of yet another cultural institution's programme policy. I'm referring to the Zagreb Centre for Independent Culture and Youth, better known as Pogon. This new model of a cultural institution, initiated by the Alliance Operation City and established in partnership with the City of Zagreb in 2008, is actually a parent institution of all grassroots organizations – including social (civil) and art organizations – going beyond the Zagreb city area (negotiations are underway on the establishment of similar cultural institutions in Split, Pula, Rijeka, Karlovac, Čakovec, etc.). At first glance, it is difficult to distinguish between the programmes of the old cultural institutions and that of Pogon. Its main programme revolves around the same art practices: dance, film, concerts, exhibitions, workshops etc., so as the end user, you have to ask yourself what is the point of yet another cultural institution of this sort. (It is interesting to note that among the represented programmes, the publishing activities are almost non-existent. Since the famous publishing house of the Zagreb Centre for Culture and Education, active during the 1970s and 1980s, not even one cultural centre has made a name for itself on the publishing scene. The reason behind this lack is quite simple: among the cultural activities previously dominated by old cultural institutions, the private businesses are most interested in taking over the activities involving education, publishing and film). However, these identical genres (media) and practices cover other issues, more relevant social problems and use different communication channels. Instead of worker's rights, these new cultural centres now address the rights of LGBT minorities; instead of the problem of alienation, they concern themselves with the privatization of public goods; instead of bulletin boards, they communicate via websites and social networks. A series of turbulent events and turning points in the early '90s drastically changed the paradigm of cultural institutions at the local, as well as at the international level. If we, in addition to the unexpected political and economic upheavals, take into account the revolution in technology and communications, the need to urgently respond to these new circumstances through some form of an organized and shared social reaction – at the level of both culture of art and the everyday (civil) culture – seems as a reasonable course of events.

Centar za nezavisnu kulturu i mlade - Pogon, Trnjanski nasip bb, Zagreb

Tako se javno-privatnom partnerstvu Laube u odgovoru na novu društvenu situaciju pridružio i Pogon kao predstavnik tzv. civilno-javnog partnerstva. Platforma je, pak, jedan od najčešćih termina koji se pojavljuje u komunikaciji koju s javnošću održavaju tijela nezavisne kulture i možda najbolje predstavlja organizacijske principe ovog novog modela kulturnog centra. Platforma najprije sugerira prostor koji se organizira horizontalno, odozdo, a ne hijerarhijski, odozgo. Drugim riječima, Pogon vam nudi komunalnu infrastrukturu i elementarne tehničke uvjete za produkciju i distribuciju vašeg kulturnog proizvoda (predstave, izložbe, koncerta, predavanja, festivala itd.). Između vaše ideje i realizacije ne stoje desetine urudžbiranih dopisa ovjerenih žigom, pregovori s posrednicima koji se nižu po hijerarhijskoj ljestvici i slično. Sve je zamišljeno da funkcionira brzo i sa što manje troškova. Osim koncepcijske usuglašenosti s općim programskim usmjerenjem, sve što vam treba je slobodni termin, telefon i računalo s pristupom internetu. Riječima Ane Žuvele iz Instituta za razvoj i međunarodne odnose, za sada je Pogon još uvijek eksperiment, koji bi trebao postati standard.

Klaudio Štefančić

The Center for Independent Culture and Youth was initiated by young people who could not satisfy their social and cultural interests within the old cultural centres (the gap between the old and the new institutions has somewhat decreased, but the dynamics, especially of Zagreb's cultural and art scene, is still being determined on the basis of that difference).

Thus, we have two responses to the newly-emerging circumstances: the public-private partnership of Lauba and Pogon, as the representative of the so–called civil–public partnership. A platform is one of the most commonly used terms in the communication between the actors of independent culture and the public. It is a word which, perhaps, best represents the organizing principles of this new model of a cultural centre. First of all, a platform suggests a space organized horizontally from a bottom-up perspective and not hierarchically, from a top–down approach. In other words, Pogon provides you with a communal infrastructure and basic technical requirements for the production and distribution of your cultural products (plays, exhibitions, concerts, lectures, festivals, etc.). There are no dozens of official documents that have to be certified and stamped or negotiations with hierarchically ranked mediators which stand between your idea and its realization. Everything is devised to function quickly and economically. In addition to the conceptual compliance with the general orientation of the programme, all you need is an available time slot, a telephone and computer with Internet access. In the words of Ana Žuvela from the Institute for Development and International Relations, Pogon is still an experiment which should become a standard in time.

Klaudio Štefančić

Nakladnik
Pučko otvoreno učilište Velika Gorica

Za nakladnika
Barbara Grđan Odrčić

Urednik
Klaudio Štefančić

Prijevod na engleski
Dunja Opatić

Lektura
Marijana Lebo

Grafičko oblikovanje
Sara Pavleković Preis, Katarina Zlatec

Tisak
Kerschoffset Zagreb

Naklada
100
Velika Gorica, listopad 2015.

Kustos izložbe
Klaudio Štefančić

Kustosice–asistentice
Sonja Švec Španjol, Andrea Vujnović, Katarina Zlatec

Tehinčka realizacija izložbe
Tehnička služba POUVG-a, Dubravko Kuhta

Na pomoći pri realizaciji izložbe zahvaljujemo:
Editi Janković Hapavel, Jošku Jerončiću, Krešimiru Kvočiću, Morani Matković, Vladimiru Nikši, Anji Planinčić, Zdravku Šabariću, Tomislavu Štrigi, Željku Šturliću, Mirandi Veljačić, Sveboru Vidmaru, Emini Višnić.

Voditelj Galerije Galženica
Klaudio Štefančić

Program Galerije Galženica u 2015. godini ostvaren je sredstvima grada Velike Gorice, Ministarstva kulture RH i Zagrebačke županije.

www.galerijagalzenica.info

galerija galženica

Sponzor

ARSKOPIJA printamo nemoguće